

## **Remarks**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the interview granted on June 12, 2006.

Claims 15-22 and 36-51 are currently pending in the application. By the Office Action, claims 15-37, 48, 49 and 51 were allowed; claims 41, 42, 45 and 50 were objected to; and claims 38-40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 were rejected. By this paper, Applicant proposes to amend claims 38, 41, 42, 49 and 50 and to cancel claim 45 to put the application in condition for allowance.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 38-40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No, 4,157,810 to Haller et al. (“the ‘810 patent.) Without agreeing with the rejection, Applicant proposes to amend claim 38 to include features of objected to claim 45. More specifically, Applicant proposes to amend claim 38 to recite that “the second element applies a generally horizontal force to the first element upon engaging the stop.” Because claim 45 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form, proposed claim 38 and the associated dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

It should also be noted that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion in the Office Action, many of the dependent claims listed above recite additional features not disclosed in the ‘810 patent. For example, claim 40 recites that “the second element has an I-shaped cross-section.” By contrast, the ‘810 patent discloses a bar 14 that appears to have a circular cross-section.

As another example, claim 47 recites that “the second element remains oriented generally horizontally as the second element swings with respect to the support member.” As agreed with the Examiner on June 12, 2006, this feature is not disclosed in the ‘810 patent.

Therefore, the Examiner indicated that claim 47 should have been identified as objected to rather than rejected in the Office Action.

**Objected to Claims Rewritten in Independent Form**

Objected to claims 41 and 42 have been rewritten in independent form. During the Interview, the Examiner indicated that claim 49 should have been identified as objected to rather than allowed. Therefore, claim 49 has also been rewritten in independent form.

**Conclusion**

Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicant believes that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

**Harland D. Couillard**

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark E. Stuenkel  
Reg. No. 44,364  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 29, 2006

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351